

the MRI. Now, who would ever have thought that elementary particle physics would lead to major findings in medicine which every doctor relies upon today?

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word, and I yield to my good friend and colleague from Washington State (Mr. BAIRD).

Mr. BAIRD. I thank the gentleman from California. Just a couple of brief comments, and it's getting late, so we don't want to carry this forever.

I would suggest that we all agree that consistency is a very dangerous thing. If the gentleman talks about being consistent, I would ask the gentleman why they chose not to micro-manage the vast expenditures of dollars, not even to have oversight hearings of the vast expenditure of dollars on the war.

If you really want to save the taxpayer dollars, we are burning \$2.5 billion a week in Iraq. This entire bill is \$21 billion over 3 years. We're talking about 3 full years to fund the basic scientific research of this entire Nation, from mathematics to physics to chemistry to social sciences. That's about 6 or 7 weeks or so of what you spend in Iraq. And yet when it came to oversight of the expenditures in Iraq, the majority, then-majority party was then just virtually silent. If you really want to save the taxpayers' money, and I do, you could have looked at that.

But let me suggest what the gentleman from New Jersey misrepresents. And I asked earlier if any folks on the other side were qualified to study this. The gentleman from New Jersey just doesn't seem to understand how this legislation works. He completely misrepresented when he said that it is incumbent upon the majority and the chairman who is bringing this forward to defend these studies. Sir, this bill does not authorize specific studies. That is not how the authorizing language for the National Science Foundation works. It would be ludicrous, and you should know that; and if you don't know it, you are not qualified to speak to this. But it would be ludicrous to suggest that when you authorize a foundation, that you are authorizing every single specific study or that you know what all those specific studies are. That's not how the National Science Foundation works. That's not how we authorize it. That's not how this bill functions. And it's indeed not how many, many of the authorizing bills function here. So to suggest that, to bring forward a broad authorization bill that gives responsibility to a foundation, one has to justify every single study is to misrepresent how this legislation works. And that's the problem. I think the gentleman either misunderstands or misrepresents how the legislation works.

I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. ANDREWS). The question is on the amend-

ment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. CAMPBELL
OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. CAMPBELL of California:

At the end of section 3, add the following new subsection:

(h) REDUCTION.—Each of the amounts authorized to be appropriated or made available under this section shall be reduced by 1 percent.

Mr. CAMPBELL of California. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Washington mentioned that he didn't think this last amendment that I proposed was the correct way to save money, so perhaps this is the more correct way; maybe this is something that he would find more to his liking.

H.R. 1867, this bill before us, would increase spending for the National Science Foundation by 9.9 percent in the first year, 7.4 percent in the second year and 7.3 percent in the third year, for an increase of over 25 percent over a 3-year period. Now, Mr. Chairman, that is an amount, and I, too, am someone who has sympathy for some of the things that the National Science Foundation does. However, even over the last few years where we have had very large percentage increases in our revenues to the Federal Government, they haven't been as large as this over the last 3-year period. In fact, in the next 3-year period, any of the prognosticators, whether it be the Office of Management and Budget or any of the other prognosticators, are not estimating that we will have a 25 percent increase in revenue over the next 3 years. So therefore, this proposes to increase spending at a rate greater than revenue is projected to increase over the next 3 years.

This amendment would simply reduce the amount of this increase by 1 percent per year. So instead of increasing by 10 percent the first year, it would increase by only 9; instead of increasing by 7.4 percent, the second year would increase by 6.4 percent; and 7.3 percent, it would increase by 6.3 percent in the third year. These are still large annual increases, larger than most taxpayers at home are likely to see the increases in their incomes, in their salaries, in their wages.

So this is just a small reduction. It does not deal with, as the gentleman from Washington mentioned, it does not specifically say what, it leaves that

issue open. So, therefore, it does not interfere with the selection of these various proposals and research things that the gentleman from Washington just supported in the last amendment.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for an "aye" vote.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, here's the problem with what the gentleman is proposing, however well-intentioned it may be. And I am deeply concerned; as the gentlemen know, I serve on the Budget Committee with some of the gentlemen who are speaking, and we are all concerned about the long-term deficit picture for this country. However, if you cut investments in scientific research and scientific education, in the long run you will increase the deficit of this country, and you will decrease our national security, our national health care and our national and international competitiveness. That is why this is a mistake.

And don't just take my word for it. The National Academies of Science, in *Rising Above the Gathering Storm*, a 2005 publication, called for more than a 10 percent increase; the U.S. Commission on National Security, the Hart-Rudman report, a similar level of increase; the President's Council of Advisors on Science and Technology, in their publication, *Assessing the U.S. R&D Investment in 2003*; a coalition of 15 industry associations, in the publication *Tapping America's Potential*, in 2005; the Council on Competitiveness in their publication, *Innovate America*.

This is not just a Democratic proposal or Republican proposal. I would remind the gentleman that this bill passed unanimously out of committee with bipartisan support.

I would also encourage you to ask your faculty administrators, ask your high technology industries, do you think this country is spending sufficient quantities on fundamental basic research and investment such as that funded by National Science Foundation? And do you think we are doing enough to keep our young people educated in science and math in ways such as supported by this legislation? I guarantee you most of them would say no. You would, I think, by this cutting, with due respect, significantly be impairing, and it sounds like a small measure, but remember, we are already falling behind in a number of areas in science and math, not only in the education, but in the applied fields.

This is consistent with President Bush's own administration request of a 7 percent per year increase. Again, this is a bipartisan approach, not a Democratic or Republican approach. The President has called for this. And again, as Dr. EHLERS said so eloquently earlier, our return on investment from research is profound. And when you cut that investment, I think you're cutting that return on investment.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.